

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE MUSEOLOGICAL OBJECT

"Exhibiting is or should be to work against ignorance, especially against the most refractory of all ignorance: the pre-conceived idea of stereo typed culture. To exhibit is to take a calculated risk of disorientation - in the etymological sense : (to lose your bearings), disturbs the harmony, the evident , and the consensus, that constitutes the common place (the banal). Needless to say however it is obvious that an exhibition that deliberately tries to scandalise will create an inverted perversion which results in an obscurantist pseudo-luxury - culture ... between demagoguery and provocation, one has to find visual communication's subtle itinerary. Even though an intermediary route is not so stimulating : as Gaston Bachelard said "All the roads lead to Rome, except the roads of compromise." (1)

It is becoming ever more evident that museums have undergone changes that are noticeable in numerous areas. As well as the traditional functions of collecting, conserving and exhibiting objects. museums have tried to become a means of communication, open and aware of the worries of modern society. In order to do this , it has started to utilise modern technology now available and lead by the hand of "marketing" and modern business management.

Others take on the role of socio-cultural centres, striving to take part or be a vehicle of the development of their particular area.

Attention should be drawn to the new place and function of those who take part in it (professionals - public - creatives) as well as the notion of patrimony, of the museum object and the collection. The power of decision is re-equated in terms of possible self-management or at least a greater accessibility of each one involved in museum management.

In both cases, the exhibition continues to be the centre of a museum's activity, whether this is a product or a process exhibition.

This means selecting must take place (in an autocratic or participatory way) of a collection of objects in the widest sense of the

word, which would be exhibited for their consensual value, for the value attributed to them or for the significance that they may take on.

Once placed in museum lay-outs, or in context, explained by way of sub-titles, personal or collective speeches, videos and slides, the object in itself collected for this purpose is without doubt the soul of the exhibition and the catalogue.

These very objects, which the exhibition means to transform, manipulate and alter.

Objects which are thus the real *raison d'être* of MUSEOGRAPHY and at the same time the voluntary fruit of the same museography on the one hand and on the other conforming to multiple chosen or alien circumstances, just like the voices, the movement and the foot steps of the visitors.

Without getting into an argument over the possible scientific character of museography, it is certain that for a long time, museography corresponded to a collection of rules which assured the "correct" exhibition of the objects. It was in this period that the contemporary museography took its form, perfecting itself and producing novelties in every possible aspect.

At the service of the object or the idea, we should recognise that museography and exhibiting techniques in general constitute more and more of an autonomous means of communication with relation to the museum.

Present at every moment, museography in its progressive complexity of means and methods is in itself and information support vehicle for all day to day aspects both inside and outside the museum.

Thus the museography object, exuberant or submissive, respected or manipulated is essentially an "inherited" object.

In this sense, it is impossible to keep thinking of the museological object as if in fact it were not inherited, with all the impositions this would entail. Under the status of a museum object, Ulpiano Bezerra de Meneses synthesized four ways to understand a museological object.

"Fetish object". - The most common characteristic of an object in a collection is in fact, the role it plays in the exhibition which is its

fetishisms. Thus, the fetiches or replacement consists in moving the level of human relations and presenting them as if they were derived from objects, autonomously. So, the material objects only possess properties of a physical-chemical nature: weight, density, texture, flavour opacity, geometric form, durability, etc. etc. All other further attributes are applied to things. In other words : senses and values (cognitive, affective, aesthetic and pragmatic) they are not senses and values of things but rather senses and values which society produces, stores, circulates and consumes, recycles, throws away, mobilising this or that physical attribute inherent in things (and naturally, according to the historical patterns, subject to change) ...

The metonomic object. - The metonymy (a rhetoric figure which in part is worth all) is present, with reiterated frequency - and risks of deformation - in anthropologic exhibitions and on a lower scale historical ones also. The metonomic object loses its documentary value, changing to a more predominant emblematic value. Imagine that it is possible to, by way of the museological exhibits, express the "meaning" of a determined group or culture and museums cannot fall into such ingenuity : it really is not possible to "exhibit cultures" ... , the use of the typical, the stereotype for simplifies ends - forever reduced and with the risks so well known and so often denounced, principally when certain suspect and problematical objectives are in play, such as how to create or strengthen a cultural identity : the simplifications always cover up the complexity, the conflict and the changes and work as differential or exclusion mechanisms.

The metaphoric object. - The metaphoric use of the object, in a mere sense of substituting a relation, although less unpleasant than the previous, it still reduces the exhibition to one of objects which just illustrate problems formulated independently of themselves. Thus, in this way the museum loses a specific advantage and its most powerful resource, the work with the object. This posture shows an incapacity to come face to face with the object, to explore it in its own terms, instead of preferring verbal support not just to formulate the concepts, but also to express them : this line of action lessens the real use of the museum.

This tendency, which shows a certain despair, indolence or disorientation, is not new. In the decade of the seventies of the last century, George Brown Goode, who was one of the great directors of the Smithsonian Natural History Institution, said ironically that a good didactic exhibition was the one that had a complete set of name tags with the odd sample of natural specimens here and there ...

The object in context. - The banal and current consideration that the decontextualised object is a disfigured object, which has legitimately posed the question of context and the necessity to present it at the exhibition. Strangely, however, no such force has been seen in the concept of the object. Thus, the immediate solution, prompt and ready, is the mere reproduction of the context while the appearance, that is the empiric boundary which, as such, needs to be explained, as it is not auto-significant. This given empiric confusion, from documentation, with the necessary information gleaned, the cognitive synthesis, is responsible for the worst vices fed by good intentions without intellectual investment. By way of its ever-present and insidious character, it would be wise to point out clearly its insufficiencies and distortions.

The first of these is that the objects have a history, and a passage in the same and they cannot be frozen arbitrarily in one of their several contexts. In second place, the dominant state ignores that the object's transformation process into some document is in the final analysis the axis of museolisation, it introduces references to other spaces, times and meanings within a contemporaneity which, the museum's, the exhibition's and its usufructuaries. ... This complex network is not free. It should serve, fundamentally, as to warn the museologist against contextual and background illusions and fraud which it could forebearingly construe.

Lastly and most important of all, the reproduction of contexts that are pure appearance, inverting the role of the exhibition in creation of knowledge :on the contrary of these apparent relationships and cut the superficial unity of it which is

only empirically verifiable, although deep and substantial (even though not sensorially perceptive but visible in the exhibition), the opposite of this critical and creative force, the exhibition from the beginning is strengthened by the prompt action that the senses can deliver, masking the invisible articulations however decisive."(2)

Also about the problems of "setting up and exhibition", Jacques Hainard, assumed that "the object is not the truth of absolutely nothing", and suggests that we think clearly about the place of an object in the museum. The curator chooses, making the choice of the position of the object in this way he is "glass-casing" the glass case itself almost becomes a holy object. Having placed the glass case on a plinth, decorated it, adapted the necessary illumination, having placed another plinth inside accompanied by a label, which by the way the object is looked at symbolises a privileged and special exhibition place : the Museum -Temple.(3)

Such a museum, (in the physical sense), which in ultimate analysis is always a support to the object, a particularly evident situation when Daniel Buren exhibits as an exhibition the very walls of the museum with the missing spaces for the pictures.(4) Without letting us forget that the actual language of an exhibition is also artificial due to the fact that it is mixed, characterised by its variability, translatability and reductability, which on its own only goes to complicate the role of understanding and the museological function of the object even more.(5)

Thus it seems legitimate to find other investigation tracks to solve this problem, not only to find a more consistent museographic writings and vocabulary, but also to understand better the actual limits of museography and thus in this way handled more cautiously or even cautiously.

The museography that we are going to talk about takes as its theme that it is possible that an object exists in museography that it has not been inherited but rather created and thus it has escaped its museological destiny.

This hypothesis nothing more than the recognition, which has arisen so many times in museography in that the object serves as a

means of communication not restricted to the simple service of the museum. At the museum's service, museography adapts itself and develops depending on the introduction of new elements, or just simple technical improvements of elements already used : better lighting, letter-set, signs and interactivity among others. But museography as a means of visual communication can use and deepen the communicative potential of the FORM, not inherent in the object, but created by every situation, above all when we take into consideration what Pierre Francastel wrote : "The understanding of a work of art is not based on the process of recognition, but on understanding. The work of art, is the possible and the probable; it is never a certainty."(6)

So it seems to us that bringing the accumulated experience of generations of sculptors, who have imagined, studied, treasured and thought upon the world of constructed forms, to the world of museology and museography in particular would make sense.

If we were to try and understand the evolutionary work process of sculptors, (or those who consider sculpture as their means of communication) at least throughout this century, we could deepen the creative knowledge and the interpretation of the FORM.

In this sense and only with this end, we are going to quote some works (mostly those of authors) who can appraise the ways of learning about the FORM, in a way that would probably help to rethink Museography

This identification work made up of a widely known vocabulary as a necessary element of approach to the creator of a work of art, and could in its own way, clarify the museologist about a part, a new way of communicating, an improved and adapted social function of the museum. "The artist, like the writer, has a need of a vocabulary, prior to taking the risk of *copying* reality. It is this vocabulary that he can only discover together with other artists."(7)

To follow we quote some authors, although it is obvious that we do not pretend to impose schools or currents of thoughts artificially as all of them have witnessed experiences in diverse senses. On the other hand, it would always be possible to select an infinite number of

other works by other authors, perhaps having more sense, in order to illustrate this process of knowledge and construction of form. The examples that we give hereafter should be considered in this context.

Sculpture offers an immediate understanding when representing the human body in its different dominions - religious, commemorative, symbolic, decorative, even when it represents the ideas of rigour and beauty, translated into a perfect relationship, through the materials used in the work. This use of form is patently obvious in Auguste Rodin or Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux and certainly in Italian neoclassicism, where the essential forms and their description are dominant.

The same cannot be said by those authors who show a diverse understanding of the human body and the animal by way of the use of textures and the enhancing of the composition of forms as the works of Henry Moore, Giacometti and Germaine Richier show. In these cases the understanding becomes more complex. Their works show something more than just what is visible, it tells a story whose boundaries are those of the form itself. The "Destroyed City" by Ossip Zadkine exemplifies this state. They are forms that suggest certain ideas by way of the elements present such as the dimension and positioning of the hands, the balance of the whole, or the resistance to almost anything that occurs due to the position of the arms. "The head and the trunk are thrown back, the face is disfigured with pain, a distressing scream comes out of the mouth, the arms are gigantic, the hands tormented, the sculpture as a whole is convulsed and suffering but all the same it is very much alive.....There is such a terrible expression in its image straight out of Picasso's Guernica, but it is conceived as a force which comes to announce the resurrection that Rotterdam came to know....

By way of this work, an aspect of modern art reaches its zenith - the point that the brutal images explore the subconscious mind and confront us with deliberate nausea, which is the essence of our age, (8) These forms are however elements of a relatively simple vocabulary.

On a par with the use of the forms' power of suggestion, there is also the discovery of new materials and the possibility of creating new forms "auto-sufficient", which serves an abstractionist (exemplified in the works of Barbara Hepworth and Hans Arp), which in a certain way are placed on the other side of simple and evident vocabulary.

As a similar significance a new "quality" of form is the movement present in the works of Naum Gabo, Moholy-Nagy or Alexander Rodchenko since the 20s, should be taken into consideration; works which are linked to Russian constructivism and which were of such great importance in the directing of the arts. It is the kinetic art illustrated in Calder's mobiles and Nicholas Schoffer or Jean Tinguely's proposals, where the idea of movement and machine interwove. Also the possibility of creating structures and designing them in three dimensions was discovered. This was done by creating forms for this or by inheriting forms by recuperation or by diverting functions (David Smith and certainly Louise Nevelson).

It is our understanding that the first half of the century was characterised by the battle to discover a new language. It is taking into consideration that the way that the new vocabulary of forms is spoken and written is apparently unending and capable of being based on points of reference from a world of ideas be they transparent, metaphoric or just sketched.

Throughout this learning period of how to handle and to utilise the form, this also was the object of rethinking, within the scope of a more or less compromised sociology. This state is very much present in the works of Marcel Duchamp and Meret Oppenheim, and as a rule in surrealism by way of desfunctionalism of everyday objects and the showing of hidden faces. Marcel Duchamp in his *La Mariée mise à nu par ses célibataires même* (1912 - 1923) meant "simply, I thought of a projected idea, of an invisible fourth dimension, in that it could not be seen by the eyes he considered the fourth dimension could be projected by way of an object of three dimensions, or in other words, that every three dimension object that we do not see directly, is the projection of something in four

dimensions , that we are unaware of. It was a little bit of sophism, but it could be possible. It was on this theory that I based the *Mariée* 9)

Robert Rauchenberg, Jasper Johns and naturally Claes Oldenburg, present practically all the elements of this new vocabulary, which has acquired form and meaning, by the change of context, materials and scale.

At the end of the 60s and the beginning of the 70s, another movement took shape and it intended to take artistic works away from the commercial circuits and the competition, asking for the public's participation (a happening / performance = giving value to an exhibition and opposing an exhibition. The recuperated materials, the forms produced and the objects used translated into a compromise of a political nature and very much assumed in Europe especially in Italy. (Michelangelo Pistoletto, Jannis Kounellis). In his own way Joseph Beuys proposed to work by adorning interiors with extremely divested objects, and certain materials such as felt and grease

Other authors such as César or Arman could also be included here in there battle for experimenting, even though it is not easy to relate them to a specific movement. In this period the representation of the human body is introduced in the presentations as a support elaborated by way of a discourse identified with such people as George Segal, Alan Jones and Ed Kienhols. Here the human body despite its realism or even its hyper-realism with which it is represented and only truly signifies by the intention or composition in which it is exhibited. The look of the personages even when not physically represented gave the true sense of the work of these authors.

"As I get older I get less interested in the way a thing looks and more interested in the spirit that hides within it; so the things are meant to be looked into, rather than looked at" (10)

The way in which this sculptor presents the relationship between the observer and the object goes to demonstrate the evidence that the object transmits not just itself but the idea that it suggests. This short lived sense which is markedly present in the works of Christo Javacheff, Robert Smithson and Sergui Aguilar mixing as they

do snips of nature, which underlines the role of the object as purely a support to the given "intention". And possibly "The ultimate object of art is to portray the hidden sense of things and not their appearance: as it is in this profound truth that its real value resides, which appears on the contours of the exterior" as Aristoteles claimed. (11)

Frank Popper helps us to understand what common to all these forms and what transforms an object of art when finished into a happening or an open work of art. "Without meaning to diminish the individual, creativeness we prefer to give more relevance to the quality of the *CREATION* itself. The act or acts of creation can only take place when the atmosphere is favourable to public creativeness. A large number of artists work in this way nowadays. They don't dedicate themselves to the traditional preparation of a purely personal plan. They no longer create a work of art but instead participate in the installation of an atmosphere within which a aesthetic plan can be established, with relationships with different people and different psychological and physical phenomenon. In this sense we cannot admit totally that the concept of the work of art persists, because the author survives.

At the same time that relationships are established between the object, the public and the artist, thus weakening the importance of the artist. He himself assumes a new role corresponding to the progressive disappearing of the hierarchy between arts and their limits. The new role of the artist should be made evident, within the present relation and its aesthetic model, not only from an artistic responsibility but also a social responsibility"(12)

In fact the actual physical presence of the artist assumes a determining role just like the author, presenter and/or questioner,(13) or the animator integrated within the very museum, as was made evident by Pierre Gaudibert (14)

In the 60s, we can say that the new materials (plastic, fibre-glass, metal alloys etc.), were those used which made for the creation of more consistent forms and for the experimentation of others. In Europe as well as the USA, all the accumulated knowledge - the

manipulation, creation, alteration - at the service of an easily understandable language.

What is much easier is that the expressive elements multiply in every work of art placing the problem of intentionally and / or calling for a never ending memory of every one of them.

It is the memory of "being" as opposed to "the memory of things".

The reading that one makes is not one of a work of art in itself, but the work in relation to the person who is admiring it. "the essential is no longer the by itself but the dramatic confrontation of the same by the spectator as a perspective situation." (15)

It is the metamorphose, not of the Gods in sculptures, when the Sacred abandon them, as Malraux pretended, but the metamorphism of sculptures within real images.

In this sense we can accept the understanding of Arnold Hauser, who expressed the fundamental intentions of a work of art as . "The legitimacy of the intention of art is based on the constant intromission of artistic production in the praxis; also supported by the circumstances of the art and never wishing only to represent, but always to persuade at the same time. Never only an expression, but always a solicitation as well; the rhetoric is one of its most important elements. The most simple and objective enunciation of art is equally an evocation, a provocation, a submission and very often even a violation." ... Art always means to modify life ; without the feeling that the world is a "roughly sketched outline", as Van Gogh said, if so there would be precious little art. It is in no way merely the product of contemplative behaviour, which simply accepts things in a passive way. It is much more, a means of possessing the world by force or by cunning, to dominate people by way of love or hate, to take advantage directly or indirectly of sacrifice. Just like as the Palaeolithic men drew animals to hunt, kill and capture, the drawings of children are not a representation "without interest" of reality; they also show a kind of magic lens, showing love or hatred and they are used as a way to dominate the persons there in represented. If we utilise art as a means of subsistence, a weapon in a battle, as a vehicle to free one's

aggressive impulses or as a sedative to calm our anxieties of destruction or lies, if we were to want to correct ourselves through it, the imperfection of things or demonstrate ourselves to be against its undefined form or against the lack of feeling and finality, art is and continues to be realist and active, ..." (16)

The resulting form of a process like this is understood but it is not what gives the support in a possible sense and / or rationalised in an open dialogue; it is this precise fact which seems to us could indeed enrich the museographic language.

In these terms the challenge which is created by the introduction into the museum of a form-like utensil(not inherited, but construed as a work of art understood in the referred feelings) as a support to the communication of ideas.

Thus the transformation of ideas into intelligent forms, demands ideas to communicate on the one hand and on the other to demand the knowledge, the competence and the sensibility to be able to construct these forms as well.

The exhibition of the objects in glass-cases, plinths, wall-hanging, even enclosed in a scenario which is self-explanatory, the text where Ulpiano Menezes shows that a primitive writing form is only adaptable to the iconic character of the majority of museums.

It is certain that the primitive exhibition when produced in certain conditions could take on contours and the feeling of a process which in the ultimate analysis overtakes its own formal interest, be it documented or even suggestive, this would be an exhibition-pretext, equated by H.de Varine, where the teaching / learning process show themselves to be the principal instrument of transformation and not the exhibition in itself. This type approach which assumes a fundamental role in the basic problem of community museology not just showing a new museography in itself but also remaining in an equally primitive writing. However it must also be understood here that the object, in the lay sense of the word, loses its central place in the exhibition and is relegated to a merely supportive function.

As the catalogue Documenta V states "in an ever increasing tendency for exhibition themes to be less the works of art themselves

and more the exposition of the exhibition as a work of art ... the works presented are stains of colour - carefully chosen - from the frame which makes up each section (room) as a collection. There is even an order of colours, these being chosen and placed according to their function of feeling / design of the section (selection) which stretch and present themselves ... The exhibition is thus "valued receptacle", where art is not only assumes itself as it destroys itself, well if only yesterday the object was shown thanks to the museum, so today it only serves as a decorative "gadget" for the survival of the museum while the picture, this picture where the author is nothing more than the organiser of the exhibition".(17)

The re-newal of museographic writing thus implies (apart from the function that can be attributed to the exhibition and the form in which it is conceived) the adoption of a more efficient and open language, occupying a similar place as the work of art.

To reach this point we can conceive a museum given to processes both participating and not, and of specific knowledge exhibiting ideas for public and private consumption by way of significant forms which appeal to the emotion and the senses and to the memory of those who are contemplating them. A museum where dialogue is liberated from the mooring-lines of collections and in this way could never be thought of as just one more Museum of Art.

It is in this context that we have caused the creation and modeling of maquettes of exhibitions, in the Forms and Means of Communication studios integrated in the Post-Graduation Course in Social Museology, given at The Lusophone University of Humanities and Technology of Lisbon.

Of the works undertaken it was possible to set out an analytical lay out which when applied to each work permitted us to classify them with reference to the others.

Thus two types of readings were made evident. A fluid reading composed of the understanding of a succession of elements and an instant reading where all the work is understood in one moment.

The meaning which is intended to give the proposals in a way that they can be obtained by diverse means when referring to form and the materials used.

As far as the form is concerned, the common reference to determine the dimensions and the possible estimate, the alteration of scale, the repetition and or isolation of the forms, that allows the forcing or lowering of references and the introduction of new perceptions.

As for materials the alteration of what is considered socially adequate is confirmed as a desfunctionarization factor as referred to above, opening doors to multiple interpretations.

The alteration of the form by exclusion or distortion of the parts, equally creates a significant void that can possibly be filled in the act of confrontation.

The introduction of altered or transformed colour could produce the same effects as those caused by the alteration of form.

In all the cases of movement, the structure, the texture and the appeal to the symbolic, has shown through simple means of elaborating proposals of forms which are the vehicle of perceptive intentions with the condition of not substituting our memory for an immediate and reduced vision.

The works produced were not the result of some discovery, but simply a try at evaluating the interest of appealing them to museological discourse the accumulated knowledge of manipulation, creation and alteration of the form / forms that we have referred to above.

It does not mean to produce a hermetic work which Picasso confirmed saying " How do you want a spectator to see in a picture what I saw ' ... how can anyone enter my dreams, my instincts, my desires, my thoughts, which took such a time to elaborate and to reveal, above all to catch what I did even against my will ?", (18) not even to exhibit as one would exhibit something on a shelf of a supermarket.

Between these two extreme situations one has to find " the subtle itinerary of visual communication".

The possible ways, which are revealed by the experiments we undertook, are principal ordaining of museographic ideas, which have already been widely marked by Henrich Wolfflin one of the founders of formalist readings of art, which we consider can really help define such a minimal vocabulary of the expression of form, starting with the five oppositions of analysis of the works of Durer, in the XVI century and Rembrandt in the XVII century. -Linear / Pictoric, frontal / profound, closed form / open form, multiplicity / unity, clarity / obscurity. (19)

The notions or ideas of balance, juxtaposing, transparency, clarity and shadow, synchronism, sequence, tension, deformation, centrality, figure and background, are not alien to some museographic practices. However we should grant a proviso that the current use by some museums (The Quebec Museum of Civilisation or La Villette in Paris as examples) and put only to the service of the museological object which is intended to be exhibited and not with conforming elements of a new language of creative forms.

It is thus a paradox that the museums that house the most varied collections of art, which in themselves show a never ending world of imagined forms, do not use, (nor are they very worried about it). the fruit of labour that has brought into existence these same very forms. The linear and ikonik reading of The Guggenheim Museum is a faithful image of this paradox. Rarely has a museum ignored the nature of its own collections so much, where in first hand, new forms of understanding the function of art are revealed both in the organisation of space and for certain in society. The indifference to Frank Lloyd Wright and his sense of innovation is evident, that the works of art in particular the sculptures which themselves introduce a definition and perception of space, if only a linear reading is proposed, being the same from beginning to end and from top to bottom. (20)

There is nothing more pathetic than *Schneefall* by Joseph Beuys, lying on the floor of this long corridor. The Guggenheim Museum " can be considered in any case as the symbol of the ever present difficult relationship between architecture and modern art, and

this continues even among the new museums as well as the permanent and temporary art galleries.

The basic problem is that museums are given a significant symbolic and monumental value, an ideological importance, as if we were dealing with a new cathedral. This is the reason why the ambassadorialness of the construction faced primordial importance, the role of the architect is enlarged, very often in detriment to the real function of the building. A function which in fact is very delicate, as one of its ends, the assigning of its inside space, in order to show off the specific characteristics of the works of art, which themselves have their own structural space. (21)

Here is where we place the understanding between the museum and the space to be used as a means of confrontation between the public and the authors.

This relationship is exemplified in some works of Daniel Buren in a particularly interesting form. Emanating from a neo-classical building of The Rath Museum of Geneva, constructed at the end of the last century, this author first created on the outside a collection of façades, cut on the parallel to the oblique elements at the entrance of the museum and painted them with bold strips, in this way it showed and hid the building. In the inside these elements (from this shell) now appear in the museum which in its turn become the recipient of its exhibitions.

In the interior, the same raise strips in four colours, give form to various modules which restructure the museum space, thus guaranteeing the same discourse distributed throughout the whole edifice.

In another project and in its first stage, Buren placed 9 boats in a regatta with striped sails of different colours. In the second stage, the sails were exhibited in a museum in order of arrival. Once transformed into exhibition objects, the sails became works of art, hanging from the walls. " To dismantle the dichotomy, between the way a form is perceived inside and outside a museum, this work reveals crosses the trench which separates art and a context which is not specifically art. (22)

The inversion of the traditional relationship between an artistic object and its place in an exhibition. In the end it is the museum which is exhibited as if it were an artistic object.

In a certain way we could admit that the ideal museum would be that one which would be created specifically for every exhibition.

Throw-away museums where the form and the function would only serve the dramatic confrontation we have already mentioned.

Isamu Noguchi created among works of art, for the UNESCO building in Paris, a space where the structure itself and the sculptures that are placed there, form a coherent, significant and not inherited whole. Here we are not just speaking about the placing of sculptures in the open air, within a natural or cultivated space, but to build and organise a space whose form, be it expressive or part of shared sculptural elements placed there.

We have tried to go into the theory of museography in depth. We think in a wider sphere, we think of Pierre Francastel in an epistemology of imaginary creation, naturally we would have to ask ourselves of the idea of the appearance of any element would depend on its place and the total pattern of its function. "Far from being a mechanical register of sensory elements, the vision proves to be a truly creative apprehension of reality - imaginative, inventive, perspicacious, and beautiful ... All the understanding is also thought, all reasoning is also intuition, all conservation is also invention. The object's form which we see, however, does not just depend on its retinal projection in a given moment. Strictly speaking, the image is determined by the total visual experience which we have with that object or that kind of object throughout our lives".(23), by which we have to integrate, the role of the creative memory and its imaginative matrix, which in the final analysis conditions the creativity.

A kind of Museum / Work of Art, which would be the kernel and Shell, Intention and Form.